

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 6, after "includes" insert "confinement and".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 15, strike "States", and insert "States classified as a felony under Section 1 of Title 18 of the United States Code, and further includes any offense in violation of a law of".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 20, strike "punishable by death or imprisonment for a term exceeding one year." and insert "classified as a felony by the law of the place where the offense was committed."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 10, strike "selling" and insert "unlawfully importing or selling or conspiring to import or sell".

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. McCLORY

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the amendment an amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. McCLORY. The amendment is a substitute to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. McCLORY: Page 14, strike out lines 10 through 15, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) An offender who is convicted of unlawfully importing, selling, or conspiring to import or sell, a narcotic drug."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BURKE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9167) to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enable the courts to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill now pending.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

WE CANNOT SOLVE OUR VIETNAM PROBLEMS BY GIMMICKS

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the more appalling practices that has developed here in this House in recent months is the practice of Members releasing to the press the texts of speeches "prepared for delivery," as the saying goes, some 24 to 48 hours after the press release date. As a result the speech gets press coverage 12 to 24 hours before any Member can even hear it, let alone read it. And by the time he might wish to comment, the matter is already old hat and the press could not care less.

Such a pre-prepared address was released to the press yesterday by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] on the highly sensitive issue of internal politics in Vietnam. It appeared on page 1 of the Washington Post last night, 13 hours before this House was even scheduled to convene. It probably would not be delivered here for another 3 or 4 hours. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, unless other Members can comment on these undelivered speeches well before they finally get delivered, we will never have an effective chance to comment on them at all.

The speech I am referring to made the seemingly plausible suggestion that the United States should push at once for a plebiscite, conducted by some supposedly neutral third party, to determine whether the people of South Vietnam want the Vietcong to assume full political power in their country. Such a suggestion may get banner headlines, but as anyone at all familiar with Vietnam will quickly recognize, it contains four fatal flaws.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. STRATTON. First, it just does not make sense to talk as though Madison Avenue polling techniques can be translated in any meaningful way to Vietnam in its present condition. This is not the kind of blase, sophisticated, literate country where the roving reporter can expect to feel the public pulse. We would save a lot of wasted breath here if commentators would learn this elemental fact about Vietnam.

Second, it ought to be obvious, especially on Memorial Day, that in the middle of a war you are not helping by proposing a vote on whether you ought to surrender. It would be difficult to imagine any question more explosively loaded against ourselves.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. STRATTON. No, I cannot yield at this moment.

Third, the current political turmoil in Vietnam should have made it clear by now that the real question is not whether we surrender to the Vietcong, but how do we get the various non-Communist groups in Vietnam together into a peacetime, civilian government. Nobody has burned himself up yet to urge that the Vietcong be placed in power.

Fourth and finally, the formula for a successful civilian government cannot be

found by overnight gimmicks transplanted from our own high-powered marketing research organizations, but by applying ourselves to the tough but vital task of helping the Vietnamese people develop a meaningful election machinery of their own.

Mr. Speaker, if we in this House really want to be helpful in these difficult days, I suggest we forget about racking our brains for some new, unusual, ingenious, and catchy gimmick. We won't win in Vietnam by gimmicks. But we can win, Mr. Speaker, and we are in fact winning, by continuing to devote our energies to finishing off the military aggression, and by helping the Vietnamese people get on with the even more complex task, already moving forward under the leadership of Ambassador Lodge and General Westmoreland, of building a stable and orderly society of their own.

A REMINDER OF OUR OBLIGATIONS

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the body of the Record and to include an address.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Representative JAMES A. HALEY, of Florida, is rounding out his 12th year as Chairman of our Subcommittee on Indian Affairs. Chairman HALEY is widely recognized and respected by Indians and non-Indians alike for his patience, wisdom, and understanding of Indian problems. I know of no one who is more concerned over the plight of our first Americans than our able colleague, Mr. HALEY. The list of significant Indian legislation bearing his name or stamp of approval encompasses names of tribes in nearly every State having reservations. I was particularly pleased that on May 21, 1966, the Seneca Nation of Indians recognized his outstanding leadership by naming its new community center at Salamanca, N.Y., in his honor. It was the Seneca Indians that lost much of their land due to the construction of the Kinzua Dam and Reservoir a few years ago. Largely through the efforts of Chairman HALEY and other members of our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Seneca Indians received a fair and equitable award for the loss of their property. The James A. Haley Community Center in Salamanca was constructed from funds allocated for rehabilitation and community purposes.

A second community center, this one on the Cattaraugus Reservation, also belonging to the Seneca Nation, will be dedicated on June 25. This center will be named in honor of the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania.

The dedication address delivered by Chairman HALEY at Salamanca follows:

A REMINDER OF OUR OBLIGATIONS

My friends and fellow members of the Seneca Tribe. A few years ago, I received the high honor of being made a chief of the Seneca Tribe while I was visiting this reservation. Today you honor me further by calling upon me to say a few words at the dedication of this fine community building.

Whenever it is my privilege to participate in a ceremony of this kind, I like to remind the people that the building—no matter how

beautiful it may be—is only a physical structure. What is truly important is not its beauty nor the facilities it contains—but the use that is made of the building and the facilities.

Hence today, we should dedicate your new building to the service that will be rendered through it to the people of the Seneca Nation—service that will contribute to the further advancement of a great and proud people.

I am told that in the days gone by the Seneca, along with the other tribes of the Six Nations held their councils in the Long House. Here the great questions of the day were threshed out and the elders of the tribe gave counsel. The Long House meant security and survival for the tribe, the place which served the tribe as the capital of a modern nation serves its people.

Today we see before us a fine new community building which will serve the Seneca of the Space Age as the Long House served the ancestors in the past. Here in this new building there is a council chamber where the elders of the tribe may again give counsel as in days gone by. There is secondly a fine new cafeteria and kitchen which recall the feasts of long ago when the hunters returned laden with the spoils of the chase and the women brought the vegetable foods—corn, beans and squash—for the festival observances. Thirdly, there is an arts and crafts room where the traditional folk art of the Seneca craftsmen will be on display to remind the present generation of visitors and friends of the skills and genius of the tribe in making objects which honor the tribal achievement and its great chiefs.

The terms of Public Law 88-533 of the 88th Congress (78 Stat. 738) included the authorization of payment by the United States for certain interests in lands within the Allegheny Indian Reservation in New York required by the United States for the Allegheny (Kinzua Dam) project, to provide for the relocation, rehabilitation, social and economic development of the members of the Seneca Nation. This new community house is the first fruit of the financial recompense which the Seneca Nation so rightfully receives under the terms of this Act. This \$600,000 building is a symbol of the steadfast adherence to principle of the Seneca Indians.

One of the most impressive of the ancient rituals of the Seneca involved the rites of thanksgiving and rejoicing for the many benefits received by the Indians from the Great Spirit. In the spirit of thanksgiving almost all public festivals were conducted.

Let us today approach the new community house which has been built here in the same spirit of thanksgiving and rejoicing in the good gifts which have been showered upon mankind by the Creator. The road to the good life is a rough one but it leads to the right place. Here in this place we commemorate the great chiefs of the Seneca Nation, Cornplanter and the rest, who did so much to keep the heritage of the Indian intact during the difficult years of readjustment to the new ways of life introduced by the white man.

Many years have passed since you had the guidance of Chiefs Cornplanter, Half Town, Farmer's Brother, Little Billie, and Great Tree, but the time of adjustment continues. You are taking steps today that can lead you into the mainstream of our economic life. This is not true of many of our Tribes who have not fared as well as you.

As some of you know, for the twelve years that I have served as Chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee in the House of Representatives, I have been calling to the attention of my colleagues the sad plight of our Indian friends—reminding them of the broken promises, the inadequate programs and even the neglect that has too often characterized our relationship with its first citizens. Now people in high places have

taken heed of our problems. Let us hope a new and bright day is dawning for our first Americans—that they all now will have the opportunity to enjoy a good life.

I believe that day has dawned for the Seneca Nation.

Mr. Arthur Lazarus, Attorney for the Seneca Tribe informs me that the current economic prospect of the Seneca Indians is very promising. A recent agreement with the U.S. Pillow Corporation involves four individual stockholders of that company and the First Seneca Corporation a new company formed specifically for the purpose of doing business with the Senecas on a Seneca reservation.

Under the agreement, the Seneca Nation subscribes \$200,000 for a 25 percent equity interest in the business and will pay up to \$400,000 in construction costs for the building (which will be paid back in rent over a period of forty years), and loans the corporation an additional \$200,000, with the repayment guaranteed by the U.S. Pillow Corporation and the individuals. It is anticipated that in full production the First Seneca Corporation will employ over 125 Senecas and that the payroll will be in excess of \$300,000. The Senecas, as a result of efforts and concern on the part of our House Indian Sub-Committee have been declared eligible for the on-the-job training benefits from the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The First Seneca Corporation factory is intended to be the first facility in a larger industrial park. The Seneca Nation has applied to Economic Development Administration for a grant of \$285,000, with the Nation's contribution being \$122,000, for the construction of a water system, access roads, a railroad siding and sewerage for the industrial park.

The Seneca Nation-First Seneca Corporation Agreement already has been approved by the Secretary of the Interior subject to certain conditions, and these conditions have already been fulfilled. In the Interior Department, therefore, nothing further stands in the way of a final decision except approval of the conditions and formal release of Section 4 funds. The architect has already prepared plans and specifications for the building, which must be approved by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

You are to be commended for the work that is being done through the Seneca Nation Educational Foundation. The investment of \$1.8 million you have made in this fund will reap substantial benefits for you in the education of your young people. The fact that you are now contributing directly to the college education of 62 Seneca students—40 attending colleges in New York State and 22 attending out of state schools—speaks well for this program. In addition to the college program, you have employed two part-time Guidance Counselors and sponsored a neighborhood youth program. You are wise to devote such attention to the education of your youth—preparing them well for the positions of leadership they hold tomorrow.

These are some of the many things you are doing for the further advancement of your people.

Let us not forget, however, the promise made by the Father of our country, General and later President George Washington, to the Seneca Indians that they would be secure in their lands and homes as long as they desired. This promise has been violated, and, although the Senecas have given up their lands they will remember the words of Arthur Morgan, the well-known authority on engineering matters, in hearings before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs at which I presided—he stated that there was a very feasible alternative to the Kinzua Project. This alternative, of course, was not approved and the Kinzua Project did flood the Allegheny Reservation and deprive the Senecas of their homes. The end

result, however, has been this new community, with this building as its center.

Let this new community building serve, then to remind the Senecas of their obligations to the cause of their forefathers, the security and maintenance of their homes and firesides for all future generations. We have in this structure a splendid opportunity to pass on to the younger generation the feelings of pride and thankfulness in being members of the Seneca tribe. As we look forward to the future days we have a task half begun, the task of rebuilding the lives of those members of the tribe who were uprooted from their homes by the building of the Kinzua Dam and the subsequent flooding of their hereditary homelands. May the Senecas be endowed with all the wisdom and good counsel needed to carry on from this time forward.

I have been highly honored by the Senecas in being made a chief of the Tribe. I shall always keep in my memory this fine token of esteem from the great Seneca Nation of Indians.

This is a proud day in my life—more that I shall always cherish.

RESPONSIBILITY WE FACE AS LEADER OF FREE NATIONS

(Mr. POOL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to share with my colleagues a very fine editorial from the May 17 issue of the Dallas Morning News. This article very aptly pinpoints the responsibility we face as the leader of the free nations of the world. It is sometimes difficult for us to comprehend the ways of the Vietnamese people, as our national heritage is for the most part European; but regardless of the differences of the cultures of East and West, all peoples deserve the right to the basic freedoms of the individual. To insure these freedoms is our responsibility as the leading nation of the world, and we must never lose sight of the fact that this is our ultimate goal.

STEADY DOES IT

The current situation in South Vietnam is but another step in our education as leader of the free world. The only school in world leadership, unfortunately, is the school of hard knocks.

We did not ask to be the nation with the responsibility for helping the weak and the small nations to stay on their feet despite the attacks of communism, the political disasters caused by their own immaturity, or both. But we have it and we must fulfill it. Amid the spiteful bickering of South Vietnamese leaders how easy it is for us to play that futile, wishful game of "if only."

If only the South Vietnamese leaders had the vision to see that defeating the invader must be the first task of all free men and the experience to recognize that first things must be done first.

If only all the South Vietnamese peasants had the deep loyalty to their nation that characterizes Western peoples.

If only the concepts of reasoned debate and compromise were as fundamental to South Vietnamese politics as they are to our own.

If only the South Vietnamese had a European culture so that we could more readily understand each other.

If only we could retire behind our fleets and wash our hands of the whole discouraging business of defending small nations on the Asian continent.

register its disapproval of H.R. 13643 in its present form, and in the interest of the veterans of the City of Hoboken as well as the families of these veterans who will be deprived of the benefits as now provided by law; and be it further

Resolved, That the City Clerk forward a copy of this resolution to the Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS and CLIFFORD P. CASE, U.S. Senators from New Jersey, and the Hon. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Congressman of the 14th District of New Jersey.

How Saigon Sees All Those GI's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 31, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in a special report from Saigon to the New York Times, which appeared in the May 8, 1966, edition, Mr. Neil Sheehan portrays his interpretation of the situation in Vietnam today as seen from the view of the Vietnamese people.

The article follows:

HOW SAIGON SEES ALL THOSE GI'S

(By Neil Sheehan)

SAIGON, May 7.—South Vietnam is like a seriously ill patient whose doctor, in curing one of his ailments, ends up giving him new ones.

In the spring of last year this country was in danger of military conquest by the Vietcong guerrillas. To prevent this the United States committed American combat units and began a massive military buildup which has now reached about 255,000 American troops.

This powerful expeditionary force has robbed the Communists of their hope for a military victory by throwing a protective screen around South Vietnam's major cities.

In the process, however, the presence of so many Americans has contributed to the country's already severe economic problems by encouraging inflation, has had a corrosive social effect, and has aroused widespread resentment.

The Americans prefer to regard themselves as self-sacrificing guardians of a small country's independence. The Vietnamese do not see them in that light.

A HARSH SOCIETY

The Vietnamese live in a relatively harsh society where charity is not a common phenomenon. Thus since the Vietnamese normally do not entertain charitable motives themselves, they do not attribute them to others.

The Vietnamese instead believe the Americans are involved here for interests of their own, whether these be preserving the United States position in Southeast Asia, halting the spread of Communism, or, as some Vietnamese suspect, seeking to impose a protectorate on this country and secure military bases here for a possible future confrontation with Communist China.

"The peasants in Guatemala are miserable too," a Vietnamese said to an American friend, "but you Americans don't seem to get very excited about them."

When David Bell, director of the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) recently stated that the United States was in Vietnam primarily for its own interests, a Vietnamese columnist in a local English-language newspaper leaped on the statement

with the joy of a detective who has just obtained a confession from a suspect.

The columnist demanded that Washington henceforth cease mouthing platitudes about its allegedly selfless motives in Vietnam.

PASSIVE ACCEPTANCE

At best most non-Communist Vietnamese appear to regard the American presence as a burden which must be tolerated as part of the price for avoiding a Communist takeover. The Vietnamese are not happy about this burden and not all of them accept it passively.

The most vocal group are the ultranationalists such as the militant Buddhist leader, the Venerable Tri Quang, and his intellectual and student followers. They decry the "dollar culture" and basically view the Americans as a new type of white colonialist whose influence must be carefully curbed if it is not to engulf the country's independence and traditional social structure.

Other Vietnamese appear to restrict themselves largely to complaining about the effects of the American presence.

The Saigonese, who have always been more concerned about their personal comfort than the prosecution of the war against the Communists, complain about the lack of electricity and the fact that taxi drivers often pass them up to take American soldiers who pay inflated fares.

Americans are depriving the small middle class in Saigon and other towns of new houses and apartments and indirectly forcing their eviction from homes they already rent by outbidding them with the landlords. Where a middle-class Vietnamese can at most afford to pay 6,000 piastres a month for an attractive apartment or house, the American will gladly spend 20,000 piastres or even 40,000 to 100,000 piastres for the better villas and apartments. The piastre is valued at 118 to the dollar at the official rate, but is more realistically set at 169 to the dollar on the black market.

The lower-middle class of civil servants and military personnel watch the purchasing power of their fixed income dwindle steadily as the inflation grows. It does not help their sense of humor to see Americans eating in the best restaurants and nonchalantly purchasing PX items which to the Vietnamese are expensive luxuries.

The peasants in the countryside have more serious problems to contend with—many of them now spend a good part of their lives dodging American bombs and shells.

The Vietnamese are, in any case, a people with a latent streak of xenophobia, whose suspicion and fear of foreigners has been shaped by their long history of warfare with China to the north and the Laotians and Cambodians to the west.

The Vietnamese also share the racial prejudice of many Asians toward the white man. It is not uncommon to hear a Vietnamese refer to Americans as "monkeys" or "crooked noses."

A HUMILIATING SIGHT

The sight of thousands of their young women degrading themselves as bar girls and prostitutes is humiliating to the Vietnamese. Their feelings might be roughly comparable to the probable reaction in California, where there is still some prejudice against Orientals, if a civil war broke out there and a wealthy army of Nationalist Chinese troops moved in and began consorting with white women.

The United States is thus paying the inevitable political price in resentment for its military buildup here. This price is likely to become steeper as the number of Americans increases and the problems of Vietnamese society grow.

So far there is no evidence that the resentment is transforming itself into outright anti-Americanism in the sense that large

numbers of non-Communist Vietnamese would begin demanding an American withdrawal from this country.

The Buddhists have been the only group to express open hostility to the United States, but the Buddhists give no real appearance yet of being determined to push this hostility to its ultimate conclusion.

The fear of a Communist seizure of power is still too strong among non-Communist Vietnamese for them to reject the American presence here.

Nevertheless, political observers consider the resentment a potentially dangerous development which could under certain circumstances result in serious political consequences for the United States.

Rusk Clarifies U.S. Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 31, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is surely true that in the mind of the average individual, and for that matter in the minds of Congressmen, there is great confusion as to just what the position of the administration is relative to the Vietnam affair. It is fortunate that Secretary Rusk, in his recent speech in New York City, again attempted to clarify America's position. David Lawrence, in his column published in the Washington Star, summarizes this address by Secretary Rusk in an excellent manner and I am sure the readers of the RECORD will be glad to have this article if they missed it in their newspapers. Mr. Lawrence's column follows:

RUSK CLARIFIES U.S. POLICY

(By David Lawrence)

Uncertainty is one of the biggest factors that disturbs business. It affects not only long-range but current planning.

For many months now, uncertainty about the future of the Viet Nam situation has been hanging like a cloud over the whole economy. Chairman William McChesney Martin of the Federal Reserve Board, in a speech this week before the international bankers conference in Madrid, declared that basic decisions on the Viet Nam war constitute "the critical issue and the major problem" for the American economy. President Johnson himself has said he is trying to avoid a tax increase and wage-and-price controls.

Coincidentally, Secretary of State Dean Rusk has just made a speech in New York City which clarifies the American position and should have a decisive influence in bringing the Viet Nam problem closer to an early solution than was deemed possible a few weeks ago.

For the United States has recently cleared up many things. One of them is that America is not going to be swayed by the internal friction in South Viet Nam and intends to continue to protect that country against aggression. More important, however, is what Rusk has said to the rest of the world about the American position. His statement should remove all doubts that recent events would cause the United States policy to totter or perhaps bring about a withdrawal.

The Secretary did not mention Senator FULBRIGHT, but in the course of his speech rebutted some of the arguments that could

A2924

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 31, 1966

Perpetual caging: In many laboratories, the animals are literally never released from the cages. Some dogs have been continuously confined for as long as seven years. In such laboratories the animals, some of them in serious condition, cannot escape the water when the cages are hosed out.

Inadequate cages: Most cages are far too small. In one laboratory all the cages are 30"x30"x26". Collies, boxers, and other large dogs cannot lie, much less stand in a normal position. Cages for cats and other small animals are small and overcrowded.

Lack of postoperative care: It is the rare laboratory, Mrs. Dyce charges, that offers adequate treatment after surgery. Often they are left completely unattended.

Careless handling by caretakers. In some laboratories inexperienced caretakers are assigned to animal care resulting often in crude treatment.

INFORMATION AVAILABLE

The Animal Welfare Institute has been combatting these conditions by educational means. It offers free of charge, to any interested laboratory, two complete reference manuals, "Basic Care of Experimental Animals" and "Comfortable Quarters for Laboratory Animals." A film, "Handling Laboratory Animals," is distributed at cost.

But, Mrs. Dyce pointed out, education alone is not enough. Legislation is the only workable solution. The Animal Welfare Institute strongly recommends bills S. 2322 and S. 3059, now before the Senate Commerce Committee. Both would establish humane standards for conditions in laboratories as well as on dealers' premises.

For legislation regulating experimentation itself, the institute recommends the Clark-Cleveland bills, S. 1071 and H.R. 5647, now pending in congressional committee.

In his proposed civil rights law, now in hearing in the House of Representatives, the President emphasizes the need to guarantee fair housing by federal law and to make this a fixed premise in the American life, the need to rid the school and jury systems of those corrosive racial conspiracies which still exist, and the need to enforce law now on the books and to attack directly such organized efforts to thwart them as posed by the Ku Klux Klan and its like.

This remains the uncompleted task facing America in the granting of full rights to all. This legislation voted, the human principles so beautifully embraced in the founding documents finally will have real meaning—to all.

Congress owes to this presidential petition its urgent attention, and Congress has indicated it will give to the President that attention. There is a political momentum existing in American life, furthermore, which makes this deliberation, and the passage of such legislation, a matter of personal political fortune; and so even the reluctant in Congress must reexamine old positions.

If it is just that equality be held out, and enforced, in the schools and in the public place, where is the excuse for exempting the right to housing, without prejudice? If it is just that equality be pledged, and given, in employment, in public transportation, where is the justice in denying fair, equal hearing and fair, impartial judgment in the courts?

It is a fact, as the President has said, that for all of the guarantees of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, still there is discrimination in certain sectors of the public life. He asks, and fairly, the question: Where is the security of any when the rights of the few still are withheld?

This nation aspires to greatness. It can never achieve it—divided.

Rights for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 31, 1966

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, a divided nation can never achieve the greatness to which it aspires.

The Sacramento Bee thus sums up an editorial which favors the administration's civil rights bill.

The newspaper says the President speaks fairly when he asks the question: where is the security of any when the rights of the few still are withheld?

The Bee says the needs emphasized in the President's civil rights proposals represents an unfinished task facing the country in the granting of full rights to all its citizens. Let me quote one passage from the editorial:

This legislation voted, the human principles so beautifully embraced in the founding documents finally will have real meaning—to all.

Under unanimous consent I include the full editorial in the RECORD:

CONGRESS OWES FAIR HEARINGS ON RIGHTS

President Lyndon B. Johnson has asked the nation to complete the job of voting a civil rights law aimed at creating single-standard citizenship, at erasing the ghetto from the American scene, at securing equal justice for all in the courts and assuring full citizenship in the public sector.

Bring Them Up to Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 31, 1966

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the emphasis upon the effort to organize agricultural labor in California has created a false impression about working conditions in California. The truth is that California farmers who must compete with other farmers across the Nation are paying much higher wages than their competitors. Yet, despite this condition, those who claim to be trying to help the farmworker have concentrated on that part of the United States which leads, instead of trying to bring their competitors up to the level California has already achieved.

An excellent editorial on this subject entitled "Bring Them Up to Us" was published in the very respected publication the California Farmer for May 21, 1966. I commend it as required reading for any person or group which truly seeks objectivity in considering this important issue.

BRING THEM UP TO US

You know, it's sort of sickening to see the national press that California agriculture is receiving. Some of our friends in the East have been sending us clippings, and California agriculture is getting just about as hor-

rible a name as the University of California. And, brother, that's pretty horrible.

How come we are getting such a kicking around in this matter of wages? We have just been checking the USDA figures and we could not find any later than October, 1965, but at that time California was leader of the Nation, paying \$1.43 an hour.

We can understand the unions figuring that it's going to be a lot easier to collect \$3 dues from a farm worker in California earning \$1.43 an hour than it would be to collect dues from a farm worker in South Carolina earning 57 cents an hour. But it just shows you how phony the unions are when they claim they are organizing to uplift the downtrodden worker. If this is their motive, let them go into Pennsylvania where the average farm wage is 95 cents an hour, or Illinois at \$1.05; Missouri, 87 cents; South Dakota, \$1.02; West Virginia, 75 cents; Florida, 81 cents; Tennessee, 77 cents; Mississippi, 67 cents or Texas at 98 cents.

And what about the civil rights groups the church, SNCC, and CORE? They get all choked up and emotional about California while they should be trying to bring the rest of the U.S. up to California standards, not only in wages but in fringe benefits far exceeding any other state.

This year in California the cold weather persisted in both the north and south and in effect squeezed the harvest season up. We have an uneasy feeling that this harvest year is going to peak worse than any harvest year in the past 10 years.

At the moment of writing, the farm labor situation is adequate and right here we have to pay some tribute to the labor contractors, the guys we have attacked in the past. They have been down in Texas recruiting all winter long and they succeeded where the state and federal government recruiting teams failed. One reason they succeeded, we believe, is that the Federal Government is still trying to make an example of California, and while they have closed our borders we understand the Texas border is still a sieve for wetbacks. They have so many that 70 cents an hour will buy you stoop labor.

Our high wages have attracted out-of-state labor, but just a few days ago when the government boys got on the phone and called each state west of the Mississippi, in no state did they report any surplus farm labor.

So it appears to us that the U.S. Department of Labor is again going to be faced with the decision to grant a few braceros to California or be held responsible for sizable crop losses.

To Secure a Negotiated Peace in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 31, 1966

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, among the numerous speeches and statements I have made on Vietnam, I believe that one I made on November 27, 1965, on the grounds of the Washington Monument, bears repeating at this time. The speech follows:

TO SECURE A NEGOTIATED PEACE IN VIETNAM

Mr. Chairman, friends and all of you who seek peace in Vietnam and throughout the world.

Most of you have no doubt asked yourselves the question—as I have asked myself—why am I here today participating in this rally before this monument of our first President? What hopes, what strategy, what line

of reason or drive of emotion has brought us to this place from our homes and families throughout this great land?

There are a few critics who have said that we are seeking to undermine or subvert our country—to give aid and comfort to an enemy—to force the President into a course he might feel is wrong.

How mistaken they are.

We are gathered here today in the highest tradition of the American Constitutional process, exercising that oldest of American democratic rights—the right of citizens to peaceably assemble and petition their government.

And we are joined for the purpose of seeking that most sought after goal of mankind through the ages—peace on earth, good will toward men.

We know that the President seeks that goal as earnestly as any man. We know that he is committed to unconditional discussions with those we fight. We know that representatives of our government are seeking to open the door to negotiations in a multitude of ways.

Our purpose here is to show by our presence the strength of our commitment to that goal of peace through negotiations. Our purpose here is to pledge our dedicated efforts to creating understanding and support among the American people for all reasonable efforts by the President to achieve these negotiations at the earliest possible date.

The scourge of war has been man's greatest enemy through all ages. And in every war, whether of the Medes and the Persians, or the Greeks and the Romans, the kings and the emperors of the Middle Ages, or the Czars and Kaisers of more recent times—all sides have felt that they struggled for a just and noble cause.

Such is the case today. We fight under the banner of peace and freedom for Vietnam and resistance to the evils of an expanding Chinese Communist dictatorship. They, whom we oppose, likewise fight under the banner of peace and freedom for Vietnam and resistance to an expanding U.S. imperialism. The growing emotionalism that comes with all wars grips us and causes us to forget the path that led us to the present crisis, and makes us less able to understand that our enemies might feel that their cause is also just and noble.

Even those "pragmatists" who are willing to admit to errors of policy or tactics by the United States in its past action in Vietnam contend that we cannot now remedy these errors but must accept our present level of involvement and deal with the military situation by the increased use of force. How tragic this will sound when we stand on the verge of total nuclear war.

For this Administration, and the American people, to accept the thesis that we are engaged in a holy war against Communism which demands complete victory and unconditional surrender by our enemies—is to commit ourselves to the road to World War III!

The President has rejected this course. I believe that members of Congress would reject this course if it were presented to them today. And I hope that the American people in their wisdom will reject this course and will support the President in the efforts he is making to end the fighting in Vietnam.

What is required for the success of the President's efforts? To this question many different answers have been given. There are some, no doubt, who feel in all sincerity that increased bombing of North Vietnam is the answer—that this will produce an attitude of reason and compromise—that this will convince the North Vietnamese that we are eager for peace on honorable terms for both sides.

I do not agree with this answer. I reject the continued escalation of force by both sides as the path to peace. I see no evidence that either side responds to added force with any answer but more force on its own side.

To achieve peace in Vietnam, or any place in the world, requires more than a calculus of terror. It requires reason, objectivity, a dispassionate analysis—not only of military tactics but of the emotions and motivations of the other side. If we cannot step aside from the slogans and emotions of conflict and see ourselves, and the entire situation, through the eyes of all the other participants, then the chances of a reasoned solution—one in which all sides will yield up some part of the goals they seek—are indeed slight. And the tragedy of this conflict for the people of Vietnam, now being sacrificed to the global struggle between Communism and Democracy, is that on both sides they have the same humble goals. They want only freedom and peace and the opportunity to provide a little more of the good life for their children than they have had for themselves.

What steps would reasonable men—realistically seeking an end to this war—propose for both sides to take?

I suggest the following—most of which are supported by the sponsors of this March:

First, the United States should call for a cease fire throughout Vietnam, whenever the other side is ready to accept it, and announce that it is halting the bombing of North Vietnam for an indefinite period of time as evidence of its desire for a cease fire.

Second, the United States should halt the introduction of additional men and material, and ask the other side to do the same.

Third, the United States should reiterate its support for a peaceful settlement in Vietnam based on the principles of the Geneva Accords of 1954—including the eventual withdrawal of all foreign military forces, a prohibition against alliances, the peaceful reunification of Vietnam, and self-determination for the Vietnamese people—and the North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front should do the same.

Fourth, the United States should declare its willingness to negotiate with all concerned parties, including the Vietcong—a primary combatant.

Fifth, the United States should declare its willingness to accept as part of the settlement a representative new government in South Vietnam, selected through a free and fair election supervised by the United Nations, and North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front should do the same.

Sixth, the United States should declare its support for a United Nations Peace Force to supervise the cease fire, provide for peaceful establishment of a new government in South Vietnam, protect the rights of all citizens and protect the neutrality of North and South Vietnam. North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front should do the same.

We believe that these steps would bring the opposing sides to the negotiating table. We urge them upon the President and upon all of his subordinates charged with a responsibility for the American cause in Vietnam. And we urge them upon the Government of North Vietnam and upon the National Liberation Front.

It may be said that our proposals are naive and unrealistic—the product of fuzzy thinking by idealistic dreamers not charged with the hard responsibility of day to day decisions. I can only say to you that the realists—the hard-nosed, practical decision-makers—have yet to make a single correct decision or prediction in Vietnam. And all the resources of men and material of this country are being poured into South Vietnam in a futile effort to cover up their mistakes.

I can offer a simple explanation of these mistakes. The enemy we are fighting—the illiterate, fanatic little peasants of Vietnam—has been successfully imbued by their Communist leaders with a lot of fuzzy, unrealistic, idealistic notions which they are willing to die for (notions like freedom from white

colonialism and a desire for democracy, self-determination and equality), and the government we are supporting—the Generals of Saigon—has failed completely, despite all of our help, in instilling any of these fuzzy, unrealistic, idealistic notions in the people they are supposed to represent.

We have been told from the beginning that this is a South Vietnamese war—one which must be won by the South Vietnamese. Now that is forgotten.

We have been told from all sides that this should not and would not become an American war—fought with American troops. Today, it is.

We have been assured that American air and sea power would bring victory—that the bombing of North Vietnam would reduce the flow of their troops and shatter their morale. Just the reverse has occurred.

We have been told that we could not negotiate from a position of military weakness. Yet, when a flood of American forces produces military strength, we are advised by some that victory, rather than negotiation, is our goal.

It may well be that the North Vietnamese, and the National Liberation Front, discouraged and frustrated by their failure to defeat the world's most powerful nation but having little to lose after the destruction wrought in their country, may pursue the full logic of the policy of escalation we have followed. They may seek, therefore, to fully involve the land forces of Communist China and the missile forces of the U.S.S.R. in a last desperate effort to cause us the death and destruction we have caused them. This is the ultimate result of escalation. What more do they have to lose?

I have faith that the American people and the leaders of this country will choose a different path. I have faith that the President, who has announced his willingness to support the principles of the Geneva Conference, will find a way to convince the other side that he means what he says.

In conclusion, I would like to offer one more proposal which I think would add strength to the President's efforts and would receive the enthusiastic support of most of the people of the world. It is a proposal that would not merely end the fighting in Vietnam but would put us solidly on the path to a more peaceful world. I suggest that the United States propose and aggressively support a new Southeast Asia organization, composed initially of all of Vietnam—North and South—of Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, Burma and Malaysia and open to other Asiatic nations who might later seek to join. I suggest that this organization be formed on the basis of neutrality in the cold war, with each member completely free to select its own form of government without interference from its neighbors of any great power. I suggest that each member of this organization renounce military force in its relations with all its neighbors, and that each member, and the organization, receive in return the protection of a U. N. Peace Force and the guarantee of its security by all the Great Powers. As a last step, I suggest that the United States agree to channel its economic assistance to these states through a Southeast Asian Development Bank, and that it make a ten-year pledge of support which would be at least equal to what it has expended in this area in the last ten years. Other nations would be urged to do the same.

The benefits of this action to each of the member states, and to the United States, would be enormous. A tremendous cloud of fear would be lifted from this part of the world. Enormous military savings would be channelled into economic development. Governmental systems and ideologies could develop in free competition for the loyalty of the people—providing us the opportunity to demonstrate in peaceful ways the superiority of Democracy.

I firmly believe that the United States would vastly enhance its stature in Asia and throughout the world by a proposal of this sort. I believe it would give great strength to the President in the difficult task he faces in bringing about a negotiated peace. I know that the successful accomplishment of this proposal would bring new hope to a fearful world.

Mr. President, we who are assembled here on behalf of peace pray for your success in achieving this most noble goal of mankind.

The GOP and Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 31, 1966

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, Roscoe Drummond, the respected columnist, had a thought provoking and highly significant article appearing throughout the country on yesterday. Mr. Drummond comments on a statement by our distinguished colleague and very good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The Drummond article follows:

THE GOP AND VIETNAM
(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON, May 30, 1966.—In the wake of the Oregon Democratic primary's 2-to-1 endorsement of President Johnson's course in Vietnam, Republican leaders in Congress are taking a new look at how they ought to handle the Vietnam issue in the coming elections.

"They are becoming aware that if they attack the President indiscriminately, they are more likely to hurt themselves. They can't afford to throw away their advantage or being more united behind the defense of Vietnam than the Democrats by heckling the President and thus helping to disunite the country.

The Republicans have two campaign issues affecting Vietnam on which they can rightly capitalize:

A good case can be made that the Government would be strengthened for whatever tests lie ahead by correcting the egregious imbalance between the two parties in both the House and the Senate. The Johnson administration needs an effective watchdog opposition in Congress and the Republicans need more seats to fill that need.

Secondly, if the country wants Congress to back President Johnson's course in Vietnam and to give him the support he needs to exert both patience and firmness, he is more likely to get it by increasing the Republican Members than by giving any encouragement to the Democratic liberal dissidents.

The latest evidence is that the emergent Republican position on Vietnam is both prudent and constructive.

A good example is the speech which Representative CHARLES E. GOODELL, of New York, chairman of the GOP Committee on Planning and Research, is delivering in the House. It was previewed without objection by other top Republicans. In tone and substance it is in keeping with everything Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN has been saying.

GOODELL helps the administration by delivering a warning which undoubtedly reflects the attitude of the President. It is that if the South Vietnamese themselves withdraw from the conflict or if civil disorders force

such withdrawal, "the United States may have no alternative but to withdraw."

He also very usefully warns Americans that such withdrawal would not mean peace but would bring in its train successful aggression which would make worse war more likely.

"Let no one think," he says, "that withdrawal would bring an end to American casualties. It would, on the contrary, whet the appetite of our foes for further conquest. It would be, not the end of war, but a prelude to a larger, bloodier, more costly war."

But GOODELL does not leave the Republicans simply in the position of just supporting the President. He urgently counsels the White House to quit pretending it can play no positive part in furthering the conditions needed for "free and meaningful elections in South Vietnam." He proposes these steps:

1. That a pre-election agreement be promoted among responsible representatives of all major Vietnamese groups to abide the outcome of the balloting.

2. That supervision of the election be undertaken by an international commission of disinterested third-party states—not the United States nor any Communist power.

3. That as part of the election there be a direct vote on the war itself.

This is the kind of thoughtful advocacy which can put Republicans in the best possible position to go before the voters on the Vietnam issue this fall.

New Jersey National Guard Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 31, 1966

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the Record the following resolution adopted by the Army and Air National Guard of New Jersey at its Eighth Annual Conference in Atlantic City, N.J.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the views of this association which represents 17,000 National Guardsmen in the State of New Jersey merit the attention of all Members of Congress.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION #3

Whereas the Secretary of Defense has proposed and submitted a plan to re-align certain Army and Air Reserve units with the National Guard, and

Whereas the existing units of the Army National Guard are to absorb Army Reserve Personnel in-so-far as manning spaces permit, and

Whereas, Air Force Reserve Units are to be converted to Air National Guard units, and

Whereas, the continued delay is adversely affecting both Reserve Components in their planning for training and actual operations, and

Whereas the many Reserve and Guard personnel, both Enlisted and Commissioned have, these many months, viewed this re-alignment with some apprehension, and with sincere feeling and wonderment as to whether their units would be converted, absorbed and or be eliminated, to the point that they cannot adequately plan their Reserve and Guard Careers, and

Whereas, the economy of the Department of Defense and Department of the Army would be better served by the re-alignment

of both components under one central control headquarters, and

Whereas, the National Guard, over the past decades, demonstrated its ability to accomplish its mission with the least control Guidance, now

Therefore, be it resolved, by the Army and Air National Guard Association of New Jersey, in conference assembled this 7th day of May 1966, in Atlantic City, New Jersey, that the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Governors of the Several States and the members of Congress are urged to take all measures necessary to implement and accomplish the re-alignment of the Army and Air Reserve units into the National Guard at the earliest practicable date.

Further, That this resolution be submitted to the National Guard Association of the United States for consideration at the next National Conference.

Adopted 7 May 1966.

SAMUEL F. BRINK,
Colonel, NJANG, Secretary.

Needed: Political Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 31, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, from a background of past on-the-scene observations in Vietnam, Mr. Milburn P. Akers, former editor of the Chicago Sun-Times, appraises the situation today. Mr. Akers' article from the May 22, 1966, issue of the Chicago Sun-Times, follows:

NEEDED: POLITICAL COURAGE

The southeast Asian mess gets messier; the "dirty little war" gets dirtier and bigger.

Doubts have been expressed as to whether the United States should have gone into South Viet Nam in the first place and, being there, whether it should have permitted itself to be drawn into the combat aspects of the situation. Much of that is water over the dam, of course. For, as once stated by a great American statesman, Grover Cleveland, we are now confronted with a fact, not a theory.

The fact is that we are in South Viet Nam; that we are now engaged in military combat, and that we are not, as a consequence of many things, particularly the South Vietnamese general staff, doing very well.

Three years ago last February this writer surveyed the South Viet Nam situation at first hand and subsequently wrote in this column that the South Vietnamese general staff, politically oriented and professionally far short of the needed competency, constituted the main hazard to military success. This column also asserted, at the time, that inherent in the mixed-up situation in which the United States was then engaged was another Dunkirk. It hasn't come to that. And, with adequate air and sea power available, it probably will not.

But we have reached the brink of a political Dunkirk. For elements of the South Vietnamese army are now engaged in shooting each other instead of shooting Viet Cong and their North Vietnamese allies. The responsibility for this ominous situation is directly traceable to the political intrigues and political decisions of the cabal of South Vietnamese generals who have, since the assassination of President Ngo Dinh Diem, controlled the Saigon government.

Compounding their errors is the political activity of Buddhist monks and, at the other

extreme, the widespread political apathy of the Vietnamese peasants who, having been subjected to 20 years of war, want every one—Saigon troops, Viet Cong, North Vietnamese troops and Americans—to go away and leave them alone with their families, rice paddies and water buffalo.

The war in South Viet Nam is either a confrontation with communism, as Washington states, or it isn't. If it is, the Johnson administration should employ the necessary force to win the conflict or, at the least, the force necessary to bring about negotiations. That hasn't been done and there are to date few indications that it will be done for fear of bringing Red China and possibly Soviet Russia into the conflict. If there are reasonable grounds for such fears, then the United States should reconsider its basic policy of containment. For containment cannot always be accomplished without risk of war, which may escalate into atomic conflict.

If the Vietnamese conflict is not a confrontation between the West and the Communist bloc—and some doubt that it is—we should get out of Viet Nam as rapidly as possible and let that truncated and unhappy nation—Viet Nam, both north and south—settle its plight in the manner in which Southeast Asia has historically settled such problems or, if not that, turn the entire problem over to the United Nations, which, while largely impotent, is where the problem should have been placed in the first instance.

It will require a kind of political courage and statesmanship infrequently found in Washington to make one or the other of the basic decisions needed: a decision to employ whatever force may be needed to win the Vietnamese conflict or a decision to get out. The present strategy of half-way measures doesn't meet the requirements.

The Fable of the Great Big Bull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 31, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, our chief satirist, Arthur Hoppe, prepared a fable evidently using as a base President Johnson's Chicago speech because he refers to Nervous Nellie. The column, published in the San Francisco Chronicle, Friday, May 20, follows:

THE FABLE OF THE GREAT BIG BULL

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Once upon a time there was a Great Big Bull who led his herd into a quagmire. It could happen to anybody. But in his mighty struggles to get them out he managed only to sink them all in deeper.

Naturally, a few members of the herd—mostly rebellious young calves—questioned the Great Big Bull's judgment. Some thought they ought to go back the way they'd come and some were for charging off to the right or to the left or whichever.

At first, the Great Big Bull smiled tolerantly at this small minority. "It is a tribute to the democratic way I run this herd," he said, "that I allow these well-intentioned but misguided critics to speak out at a time like this. Now let us struggle on."

So the herd struggled on, floundering and thrashing about. And pretty soon they were all in up to their knees.

"Maybe we ought to stop for a minute to get our bearings," a bespectacled bull named Nellbright suggested somewhat hesitantly.

For all members of the herd were understandably afraid of the Great Big Bull.

"You have the inalienable right in this herd to suggest anything you want," said the Great Big Bull testily. "Even though you are obviously blind to experience, deaf to hope and are perhaps giving aid and comfort to the quagmire. Now let us struggle on!"

So the herd struggled on, floundering and thrashing about. And pretty soon they were all in up to their bellies.

"I know we are the mightiest and most powerful herd in the world," said the bespectacled bull named Nellbright with a worried frown. "But it seems to me our struggles are merely getting us in deeper."

This made the herd a little uneasy. "Nobody," snorted the Great Big Bull, "wants to get out of this quagmire more than I. Now let us struggle on!"

So the herd struggled on, floundering and thrashing about. And pretty soon they were all in up to here.

"We must tie a rope around our necks and all pull together," ordered the Great Big Bull. "Straight ahead, now . . . two . . ."

"But if we go that way," protested the bespectacled bull named Nellbright, "we'll all go right over the . . ."

"Listen, you Nervous Nellie," bellowed the Great Big Bull, frustrated beyond endurance, "you're trying to pull us apart to promote yourself. Anybody who turns on his own leader, his own herd, is a Nervous Nellie. Now, to preserve our democratic way of life, everybody shut up, pull together and follow me."

And it worked! The herd, not wishing to be thought Nervous Nellies by the Great Big Bull, shut up, pulled together and blindly followed their leader—out of the quagmire, up a small rise, and right over an 8000-foot cliff.

Moral: Silencing criticism in a democracy requires a lot of bull.

Public Relations Organizations Raise Professional Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 31, 1966

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, as a former news reporter both for daily newspapers and for radio and television, I am interested in a relatively new development in an allied field which is closely involved in serving the news media. That is the effort of the Public Relations Society of America to raise professional standards through an accreditation program. It is one that should be noted and encouraged.

In an article in Washington Association News, published by Colortone Press, Thomas W. Miles, a public relations counselor, recounts his reactions in running the accreditation obstacle course in written and oral examinations. He writes even though he has not yet heard the outcome. His story is entertaining—and of interest to news media and others who have occasion to employ those skilled in public relations techniques.

WHAT IS PRSA ACC?

(By Thomas W. Miles)

A new symbol of special qualification is making its appearance with increasing fre-

quency these days after the names of public relations people in association work. It is PRSA Acc. which is the abbreviation for Public Relations Society of America Accredited.

The designation PRSA Acc. in public relations is analogous to CAE in trade and professional association work. CAE stands for Chartered Association Executives, a program of the American Society of Association Executives. Bill Dalton wrote about it in a recent issue of Washington Association News.

The Accreditation Program is a bootstrap operation. Through it PRSA is trying to raise professional standards and improve the practice of public relations. The inducement is the award of special recognition to those members, otherwise qualified, who have demonstrated familiarity with the body of written knowledge developed in the field. In the Society's official literature these persons are identified as those "who, by passing suitable written and oral examinations, have demonstrated a high level of professional competence and fitness."

This is strictly a voluntary program. Members participate, or not, as they see the value. No adverse implication can be drawn from a member's decision not to seek Accreditation. Not to be accredited means simply that—and no more. After all, membership in the Society is in itself a mark of professional fitness.

Meanwhile PRSA members are responding to the program in greater numbers than anticipated. The public is also interested, judging by the notice that the program has attracted in publications. The program was a year old only in February, and yet almost a third of PRSA's 3,200 eligible members have applied.

In the Washington Chapter 36 members have been accredited. This is the figure officially reported to the Chapter President, Martin C. Powers, as of April 22. The roll is published in this issue. Of these a dozen are in the Business and Professional Association Section of PRSA and another dozen or more are in association work.

Until recently there were two routes to Accreditation: direct appointment or examination.

The former was conferred by the PRSA Board of Directors on applicants of recognized background, experience, and standing. On purpose the qualifications were made arbitrary, and stiff. For instance at least 18 years of public relations experience was required.

Another requirement was indentured service. For direct Accreditation under the "grandfather clause," as this provision was known, a member had to agree to serve for three years as an oral examiner. This was PRSA's way of organizing the cadre needed to get the program going. But after February 11, PRSA ceased taking applications for direct appointment.

The remaining route, examination, has all the compensations of personal discipline. To go back to the books after years of practical experience in the field has practical value—it can be applied. It makes the difference between general familiarity and precise knowledge.

The reading, study and review that is involved in preparation for an examination is something that many PR executives hope to get around to but rarely do. Accreditation adds the needed incentive. At this point the value of Accreditation is largely personal, however, because broad acceptance as a goal is yet to be achieved.

The examination process, both written and oral, is more formidable in anticipation than in fact. The written exam is a concentrated six-hour workout on a typewriter in a room alone, or at most with one or two others, in a place designated by the Accreditation Board that is reasonably convenient for the candidates. It is monitored by Accredited cadre members from the local chapter. But the

examination itself is prepared and answers are graded by The Psychological Corporation of New York, professional examiners. The examination is an otherwise peaceful day. There are no phones, no interruptions—nothing to do but bang the keys of the portable you are advised to haul along.

The first hour (Part I) is the testy one. The questions which cover the PR waterfront are short, and your answers can be shorter. None of the questions is tricky. This is the part where your studying comes in handy. The next two hours (Part II) are all in a PR day, except that in choosing your answers you are able to pick your job for the morning, rather than take it as it comes in the work-day world.

After lunch—comes THE problem, (Part III). This is a three-hour assignment that you select from the many offered. A hypothetical situation, and an occasional one not so hypothetical, is presented. It involves a practical PR problem. That problem is yours to solve in an afternoon—and you sip your coffee at your typewriter rather than take the time for a regular coffee-break.

It would be well to remember in answering your problem that you may have to defend your solution later in your oral exam. The oral is a two-and-a-half hour interrogation by a panel of three of your peers. Sometimes it becomes a shoptalk session that enables the panel members to become better acquainted with you.

Nonetheless it is an examination, and some of the questions are "structured." That is a requirement of the Accreditation Board. Certain questions must be asked, and certain areas explored with all candidates.

There should be no surprises in any part of the examination process for anyone with the required two years of experience and a reasonable amount of studying. All of the areas to be covered are staked out in two PRSA documents which are available on request. One provides background and answers the questions most asked about Accreditation, and the other offers a study outline with suggestions for collateral reading.

Take comfort from a veteran—there's nothing to it but moonlight labor and midnight oil.

Hospital Ship "Hope"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 31, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Richard C. Thompson of our district in California recently returned from 6 months service on the hospital ship *Hope* and has written to me about his experiences and recommendations in regard to Indonesia and the need for our support to the new administration in that country. A copy of his letter, which I am sure will be interesting to all Congressmen, follows:

SAN MATEO, CALIF.,

May 29, 1966.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN YOUNGER: After spending three months in Indonesia on the *HOPE* it is really exhilarating and astonishing to read accounts in the paper about people in powerful posts in that government who were the very ones who befriended us on the *HOPE*—the people who were so cordial, warm and friendly toward us.

And now the steps have been taken to end the confrontation with Malaysia. What role has our government played in this? If a

significant role, then D. Rusk and his team deserve the highest commendation and our press should be alerted to extend the recognition due and the congratulations to the new leaders of that country.

Congressman YOUNGER, the significance of Vietnam pales before the turn of events in Indonesia—if what we read about now happening in Indonesia can be really developed and secured.

They need our support and help—good right kind of business know-how to help the leaders make good some of their promises of a better life for the people.

President Johnson's proposal for a grand development of the Indochina area is one thing—great for propaganda now. But, if he really means anything of the kind—just think what could be done with the right kind of government in Indonesia where there are over 100,000,000 people—a grand plan in conjunction with Japan could open fantastic markets in the future.

Please make these sentiments known to the people who could really develop plans for that area. Surely Australian consultation and New Zealand could work with us to evolve an overall strategy. We must not procrastinate or delay.

Sincerely,

RICHARD C. THOMPSON.

The Weidenbruch Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 31, 1966

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, I have just had the opportunity to read the report of the delegate for Dairy and Food Industries Supply Association to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce annual meeting of May 1 through May 4.

That delegate, Mr. Peter Weidenbruch, president of the Damrow Bros. Co. in my home district, outlined the events of the chamber of commerce meeting in a concise and well rounded report, which I believe would be of interest to every Member of this distinguished body.

This report gives an excellent insight into the views of the business world of this country and expresses some of the hopes and desires of our Nation's business community for future development.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of this message in the RECORD:

THE WEIDENBRUCH REPORT—1966: REPORT ON THE FIFTY-FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES MAY 1, 2, 3, 4, 1966

One of the many services rendered by Dairy and Food Industries Supply Association to its members, is a report covering the highlights of the Annual Meetings of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

From the comments received in prior years I know that many members look forward to reading about the principal subjects that were discussed during the annual meeting.

The selected subject covered during the First General Session was timely and touched upon some of the real problems and difficulties with which our members are faced today. It was titled "How Business Leadership Can Bring About Desired Changes."

It is my considered opinion that the great majority of our citizens including the President, his economic advisers and men and

women in the administration are convinced that a change in our domestic and international policies is not only desirable, but absolutely necessary.

The Honorable John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce, referring to the signs of the times stated that, "Never have these signs needed more careful scrutiny—and more prudent interpretation—than they do today." Reference was made to the overheated economy, inflationary conditions, certain types of controls and a tax increase.

Mr. Connor made a most important statement when he referred to the working together between business, labor and government. He also said that, "Labor, for its part, must of course keep its wage demands within reasonable limit, so that both business and labor will share the fruits of the gains in productivity."

Let us hope that President Johnson will have the opportunity to read about the speech made by the Secretary of Commerce and that he will give careful consideration also to some of the suggestions and recommendations made by other speakers during the annual meeting.

It would indeed be a serious oversight on my part if I would not quote from the excellent speech by the able Executive Vice President of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Mr. Arch N. Booth, who is well known to most of us. Referring specifically to the growth of our cities and commenting on the effect some of the vital changes that have taken place in the past and will continue to affect all of us in the future, the speaker stated:

"Virtually all cities will grow—but the rate will be the decisive factor. Boston, Pittsburgh and Cleveland will all grow, for example—but at a relatively slow rate, compared to other metropolitan centers. Past growth-rate, or slow, the central fact is:

"Cities will be the focus of change.

"This country can plan for the impact, before it strikes; and only the businessmen of a community truly possess both the potential to plan for the impact of change—and something more important: you have the leverage to influence change itself. You can manage and create the change you want. You have the leverage—the means of exerting effective power to control the impact of change.

"The nation's population will do more than merely increase—by 1968, or 1980 or 2000. It will change drastically in its make-up and its characteristics:

"There will be a wrenching change in the age level of the American people.

"The young will take over.

"By 1970—four fleeting years from now—Americans will be the youngest people in the world. In 1963, our average age was about 33. Two years from now, by 1968, it will have dropped to 25 or younger.

"These young people will have more than youthful spirit. They will be the best-educated group in our population. They will be equipped to make economic and political and legislative decisions—and to take action.

"And they will be eager to do so!

"People are affected by change—and their needs and hopes and aspirations are what create change.

"And that leads us to a crucial question:

"Who is responsible—so far as impact in the past can be measured—who is responsible for the greatest measure of change which has touched the life of the average American in, say, the last 25 years?"

"Is the answer 'Government,' as some say?

"Or is it 'Labor,' as some say?

"Or is it, as others say, the powerful combination of government and labor?

"Well, where has the real innovation, inventiveness, the productivity of change come from in this country—in the past and the present?